

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated May 14, 2007 has been received and considered. In this response, claims 63 and 64 have been added. Support for the new claims may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

**Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-3, 8-13, 16, 31-33, 38-43, 47, 49, 50-52 and 54**

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 8-13, 16, 31-33, 38-43, 47, 49, 50-52 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciacelli (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,727), in view of Crick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,675,793). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Ciacelli discloses a system for providing copyright data encrypted at a central processing unit to another software module executing at the central processing unit or to a peripheral device of a central processing unit, such as a decoder, for decryption. *Ciacelli*, col. 2, lines 55-63. An encrypted decryption algorithm can be sent with the copyright data. *Id.*, col. 5, lines 40-45. According to Ciacelli,

Module 22 would use the resident encryption algorithm to encrypt the actual decryption routine of the selected algorithm pair to be used by the decryption module 23 and/or decryption device 27. The encryption module then transmits the encrypted version of the actual decryption algorithm to module 23 and/or device 27.

*Id.* Thus, Ciacelli discloses sending a decryption algorithm (in encrypted form) to a decryption device.

Crick discloses a system for allocating memory for a plurality of software routines. *Crick*, Abstract. The Crick system includes a plurality of “component device drivers”, including a device driver for decrypting data. According to Crick,

Component device driver 107 may, for example, encrypt and decrypt data transferred to and from the disk. Because the file system request is a read request, component device driver 107 cannot satisfy the request, but passes on the request to component device driver 108. Component device driver 108 actually retrieves

the data from the disk and returns the data to component device driver 107. Component device driver 107 then decrypts the data and passes the data to component device driver 106. Component device driver 106 passes the data to the I/O supervisor 105 after storing the data in its cache buffers.

*Id.*, col. 3, lines 31-41.

Turning to the claims, claim 1 recites “sending a first encrypted routine of a software driver to a peripheral device”, “decrypting, at the peripheral device, the first encrypted routine to generate a plaintext routine”, and “providing the plaintext routine to the software driver.” These elements are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. In particular, claim 1 recites providing a plaintext routine to a software driver. Further, under claim 1 the plaintext routine that is provided is generated by decrypting **an encrypted routine of a software driver**. As acknowledged by the Office Action at page 3, the decryption routine of Ciacelli is not “of a software driver” as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the Office Action at pages 3-4 relies on Crick as disclosing a software driver. However, as indicated by the cited portion above, Crick discloses only that the component device driver is provided with data from another component driver. There is no disclosure in Crick that the provided data is a plaintext routine generated based on **an encrypted routine of a software driver** or is related to a routine of a software driver in any way. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the recited elements of sending an encrypted routine of a software driver to a peripheral device, decrypting the encrypted routine to generate a plaintext routine, and providing the plaintext routine to the software driver.

Claim 31 recites a peripheral device “to a decrypt a first encrypted routine and generate a plaintext routine” and a software driver including instructions to execute the plaintext routine. As explained above, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest a software driver that executes a plaintext routine based on a decrypted routine. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 31.

Claim 40 recites “a first hardware component to decrypt the first encrypted routine received by said interface and generate a plaintext routine” and “a second interface to output the plaintext routine for use by said software driver.” As explained above, neither of the cited references discloses or suggests providing a plaintext routine to a software driver, much less a

plaintext routine resulting from the decryption of an encrypted routine, and therefore the cited references necessarily fail to disclose or suggest an interface to output a plaintext routine for use by the software driver, as recited in claim 40.

Claim 47 recites “decrypting, at the peripheral device, the first encrypted routine to generate a plaintext routine” and “providing the plaintext routine to a second software driver.” As explained above, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest these elements.

Claim 49 recites “decrypting, at the peripheral device, the first encrypted data to generate a plaintext data” and “providing the plaintext data to the application.” As explained above, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest these elements.

Claims 3, 8-13, and 16 depend from claim 1. Claims 32, 33, 38, and 39 depend from claim 31. Claims 41-43 depend from claim 40. Claims 51 and 52 depend from claim 49. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 3, 8- 13, 33, 38, 39, 41, 51, and 52, at least by virtue of their respective dependency on claims 1, 31, 40, and 49. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel elements.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 1-3, 8-13, 16, 31-33, 38-43, 47, 49, 50-52 and 54 is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

#### **Obviousness Rejection of Claims 4, 5, 7, 17-19, 21-27, 30, 34, 35, 37, 44, 46 and 53**

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 4, 5, 7, 17-19, 21-27, 30, 34, 35, 37, 44, 46 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciacelli, in view of Crick et al., and further in view of Freeman (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0129374). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Claims 4, 5, and 7 depend from claim 1. Claims 34, 35 and 37 depend from claim 31. Claims 44 and 46 depend from claim 40. Claim 53 depends from claim 49. As explained above, Ciacelli and Crick fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1, 31, 40, and 49. Further, the other cited references do not remedy the deficiencies of Crick and Ciacelli. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of

these dependent claims, at least by virtue of their respective dependency on claims 1, 31, 40, and 49. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel elements.

With respect to claim 17, the claim recites “decrypting, at the graphics chip, the first encrypted routine to generate a plaintext routine” and “storing the plaintext routine in memory in a location known to the software driver.” These elements are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. The Office Action asserts at page 12 that Crick discloses storing the plaintext routine in memory in a location known to the software driver. However, as explained above, Crick discloses only that a software driver can be used to decrypt data. Crick nowhere discloses decrypting an encrypted routine of a software driver, and does not disclose storing a plaintext routine in any manner, including storing a plaintext routine in a location known to a software driver. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 17.

Claims 18, 19, 21-27, and 30 depend from claim 17. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of these dependent claims, at least by virtue of their respective dependency on claim 17. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel elements.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 4, 5, 7, 17-19, 21-27, 30, 34, 35, 37, 44, 46 and 53 is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

#### **Obviousness Rejection of Claims 6, 20, 36 and 45**

At page 16 of the Office Action, claims 6, 20, 36 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciacelli, in view of Crick et al., further in view of Freeman, and further in view of Ho (U.S. Patent No. 5,495,432). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1. Claim 20 depends from claim 17. Claim 36 depends from claim 31. Claim 45 depends from claim 40. As explained above, Ciacelli and Crick fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1, 17, 31, and 40. Further, the other cited references do not remedy the deficiencies of Crick and Ciacelli. Accordingly, the

cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of these dependent claims, at least by virtue of their respective dependency on claims 1, 17, 31 and 40. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel elements.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 6, 20, 36 and 45 is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

#### **Obviousness Rejection of Claims 14 and 15**

At page 17 of the Office Action, claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciacelli, and in view of Crick et al., and in view of Wilson (U. S. Patent No. 4,520,232). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 1. As explained above, Ciacelli and Crick fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Further, Wilson does not remedy the deficiencies of Crick and Ciacelli. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 14 and 15, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. In addition, claims 14 and 15 recite additional novel elements.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 14 and 15 is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

#### **Obviousness Rejection of Claims 28 and 29**

At page 18 of the Office Action, claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciacelli, and in view of Crick et al., in view of Freeman, and in view of Wilson. This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 17. As explained above, Ciacelli and Crick fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Further, Wilson and Freeman do not remedy the deficiencies of Crick and Ciacelli. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 28 and 29, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 17. In addition, claims 28 and 29 recite additional novel elements.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 28 and 29 is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

## **Conclusion**

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicants believe no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

/Adam D. Sheehan/

Adam D. Sheehan; Reg. No. 42,146

LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP

5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200

Austin, Texas 78730

(512) 439-7100 (phone)

(512) 439-7199 (fax)

August 14, 2007

Date